IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA DIVISION

| Ronald Brunson, |) C/A No.: 3:11-cv-2758-JFA |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) |
| vs. | ORDER |
| Steve Patterson, Intercity Broadcasting |) |
| Manager, and |) |
| Chief David Thomas, Federal Bureau of Investigation, |) |
| |) |
| Defendants. |) _) |
| | |

The *pro se* plaintiff, Ronald Brunson, brings this civil action against the named defendants. In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Patterson had "internal devices" placed in Plaintiff's head and stomach and that Defendant Patterson has been spying on the plaintiff through the devices. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant Thomas violated the plaintiff's constitutional rights by failing to issue a "victim's warrant" to prosecute Defendant Patterson for the alleged placement of listening devices in Plaintiff's body. Plaintiff filed this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that the plaintiff's complaint should be summarily

1

¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the

3:11-cv-02758-JFA Date Filed 12/19/11 Entry Number 11 Page 2 of 2

dismissed without service of process pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Report sets forth

in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates

such without a recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and

Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on November 28, 2011. However,

the plaintiff failed to file objections. In the absence of specific objections to the Report

of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the

Report and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation

fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. The

Report is incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, this action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and

service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

December 19, 2011

Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. anderson, gr

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr. United States District Judge

recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

2